



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/903,001	07/11/2001	Mark Pratt	Pratt-02	1918
7590	05/18/2005		EXAMINER	
Michael D. Beck Baker & Daniels Suite 2700 300 N. Meridian Street Indianapolis, IN 46204			CHILCOT, RICHARD E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3627	

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/903,001	PRATT ET AL.
	Examiner Richard E. Chilcot, Jr.	Art Unit 3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 February 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No: _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims s 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall et al. in view of Kaehler. Hall et al. teaches an automated payment system for a parking facility comprising a Park Interface viewable on a computer screen and serves as a simulation of the parking facility activities by duplicating the real-time parking occupancies and vacancies occurring within the parking facility. The interface also provides for visual identification of vehicles parked in any space and includes statistics

regarding the time and date of vehicle entry into the facility and the parking space. The computer means also provides for the capture, display, storage, organization, retrieval and documentation of all parking activities and vehicle identities of any vehicle that parks in the facility. The computer means of the system further include Internet, fax and e-mail capabilities to support the transmission of parking facility activities and vehicle identities. The availability of parking spaces within the facility is communicated to motorists through variable message displays. As sensors determine the presence or absence of vehicles within parking spaces the displays are continuously updated to reflect actual parking availability. The system further conveniences motorists by providing a vehicle theft deterrent system, which activates alarms and barriers to restrict removal of the vehicle from the facility as well as to automatically, notify police, local security, the vehicle owner and other key persons upon an attempted unauthorized removal of a vehicle. The system provides managers and operators of large parking facilities a comprehensive knowledge of their parking occupancies and vacancies, when they occur and their exact locations.

While it is noted that Hall teaches all the elements of the claimed invention, including two-way audio communication, Hall does not teach using video and audio two-way communication. On the other hand Kaehler teaches the use of two-way audio and video communication with monitoring facility and the payment terminal. Accordingly, to provide video along with the audio two-way communication in the system of Hall, as taught by Kaehler, would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. The motivation for the change would have been permitting the

customer to initiate and complete an extended transaction from one location, yielding added convenience to the customer. Likewise, the change offers enhanced marketing and sales without hindering traffic flow.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed February 4, 2005, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to applicant's argument that Hall does not teach an automated payment system as set forth in the claims, the examiner is of another opinion. Applicant's arbitrary dismissal of the "charge for parking" section fails to adequately address such a teaching in Hall.

With respect to the argument that there is no motivation for the combination, the examiner clearly sets forth in the Office action a reason for the combination.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208

Art Unit: 3627

USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

HID Press Releases, March 14, 2004, note the teaching of using RFID tags for parking areas.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard E. Chilcot, Jr. whose telephone number is (571) 272-6777. The examiner can normally be reached on 5/4/9 1st Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski can be reached on (571) 272-6788. The fax phone

Art Unit: 3627

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Richard E. Chilcot, Jr.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3627